DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 030 SP 022 962

AUTHOR O'Neal, Sharon
TITLE An Analysis of Student Teaching-Cooperating Teacher Conferences as Related to the Self-Concept, Flexibility, and Teaching Concerns of Each Participant.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9048
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
AVAILABLE FROM Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Education Annex 3.203, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712 ($1.25).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; *Individual Characteristics; *Interpersonal Communication; Interpersonal Relationship; Locus of Control; Preservice Teacher Education; Receptive Language; Self Concept; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Attitudes; *Student Teachers; Supervisory Methods; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

Personal and professional characteristics of student teachers and cooperating teachers and their relation to supervision were studied. Conferences between 20 student teachers and their cooperating teachers were analyzed. Participants self-administered five instruments at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching experience: the Educational Preference Scale, Teacher Concerns Questionnaire, Rigidity-Flexibility Index, Internal-External Locus of Control, and the Self-Perception Inventory. All supervisory conferences were audiotaped. Findings indicated that cooperating teachers dominated the conferences and that teaching was discussed most often, with both participants making highly specific statements dealing with methods and materials. Cooperating teachers with high scores on the personality measures indicated concerns with the cognitive domain and tended to make specific statements during conferences. Student teachers reporting high flexibility were likely to focus on the objectives of a lesson rather than methods, materials, or execution. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

ED234030

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT TEACHING-COOPERATING TEACHER CONFERENCES AS RELATED TO THE SELF-CONCEPT, FLEXIBILITY, AND TEACHING CONCERNS OF EACH PARTICIPANT

Sharon O'Neal

Report No. 9048

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Montreal, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director

April 1983

SP 022 962

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT TEACHER-COOPERATING TEACHER CONFERENCES AS RELATED TO THE SELF-CONCEPT, FLEXIBILITY AND TEACHING CONCERNS OF EACH PARTICIPANT

Introduction

The time undergraduate students spend in field-based settings is considered to be an integral part of their teacher training program. Zeichner (1980) suggested that such experiences contribute to the development of better teachers. Most teachers would agree with Zeichner. In particular, the student teaching experience is often referred to by teachers as the most beneficial component of their undergraduate training program. This paper will examine one major component of the clinical experience; the feedback and supervision provided for student teachers.

Rationale

Copeland (1980) found that cooperating teachers have significant impact on the behavior of their student teachers. Thus the communication that takes place between cooperating teachers and their student teachers may be central to the success of the clinical experience. Yet Southall and King (1979) report lack of communication as the most frequent problem between student teachers and their cooperating teachers. They found lack of communication leading to the failure of the student teacher to meet the expectations of the cooperating teacher and the failure of the student teacher to follow through with suggestions from the cooperating teacher. These problems clearly relate to the verbal interactions that take place between cooperating teachers and their student teachers. In addition, interpersonal interactions may be influenced by the individual reference points of the participants. In other words, how cooperating teachers and student teachers interact may be related to their views of themselves, their workplaces and/or their view of the world in general. Thus describing interactions between cooperating teachers and

student teachers and relating these to differing personal reference points may prove useful to those that guide clinical education experiences.

Organization

This report will first provide a methodology section which describes the selected population and details the procedures of this study. Next, a description of supervisory conferences between 20 cooperating teachers and their student teachers will be provided. The third section will describe participants' scores on measures of personal flexibility, self perception and teaching concerns. The fourth section will discuss the synthesis of both the qualitative and quantitative data. Finally, a summary will be provided.

Methodology

The research reported in this paper is one piece of a major investigation of preservice clinical teacher education, or student teaching, which was conducted during the fall of 1981 by the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program division of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (Griffin, et al., Note 1). The overall purpose of the larger study was to describe the student teaching experience in detail. Three major questions were addressed in this research effort.

1. How do personal, professional, and demographic characteristics of the cooperating teachers, the student teachers, and the university supervisors impact on the student teaching experience?
2. How do the formal and informal institutional contexts influence the student teaching experience?
3. What is the nature of the classroom experience in the preservice clinical setting?

This paper will focus on the personal and professional characteristics of student teachers and cooperating teachers and their relation to supervision.

Sample Description

Data were collected by the RITE staff from two sites. The first site was State University (SU)*, a large public university whose student teachers were assigned to elementary schools in either a mid-sized urban school district or a smaller suburban school district. These districts together are referred to as Lakeview. At this site data were collected on 43 cooperating teachers, 44 student teachers, and 13 university supervisors. The second site was a large, private university (Metropolitan University or MU) located in a large urban center. Data were collected on 45 cooperating teachers (39 at the elementary level, 6 at secondary), 49 student teachers (43 at the elementary level and 6 at secondary), and four university supervisors who were assigned to schools in the Urban school district. The sample was composed of a general and an intensive group of participants. At each site university supervisors, principals and others were asked to identify 10 effective cooperating teachers. These cooperating teachers (10 at each site) and the student teachers and university supervisors with whom they worked composed the intensive sample (20 cooperating teachers, 20 student teachers, nine university supervisors). Cooperating teachers and student teachers from the intensive sample will be the focus of this paper.

Procedures

Sample participants self-administered five instruments at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching experience. These instruments included the Educational Preference Scale (Lacefield & Cole, Note 2), Teacher

*Names of institutions and cities have been changed to protect anonymity.

Concerns Questionnaire (Fuller, 1969), Rigidity-Flexibility Index (Hughes, Griffin, & Defino, Note 3), Internal-External Locus of Control (MacDonald & Tseng, Note 4), and the Self-Perception Inventory (Soares & Soares, 1980). In addition, cooperating teachers and student teachers audiotaped all of their supervisory conferences.

Data Analysis

Of the five quantitative instruments, two personality measures and one teaching concerns measure were chosen for closer examination. This study will report findings from the Rigidity-Flexibility Index (Hughes, et al., Note 3), the Self-Perception Inventory (Soares & Soares, 1980), the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (Fuller, 1969), and the transcribed supervisory conferences. A discussion of the analysis of each data source follows.

Conferences. To describe the supervision and formative evaluation of student teachers, audiotapes of all conferences conducted by cooperating teachers and their student teachers were analyzed.

Selected conference tapes were first transcribed and then coded using a variation of Weller's (1971) MOSAIC system of analysis. This coding system was developed to provide information about the process and the content of the conferences. In terms of process, the coding focused upon describing the exchange of information between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. Who did the talking, to whom the talk was directed, and what type of talking occurred were described. In terms of content, the nature of the topics discussed in the conferences was examined. Three major categories were included under content: "teaching," "organization of student teaching," and "other." A summary of all categories and examples are provided in a previous report (O'Neal, Note 5). An overview of the analysis of the conference data is provided in Figure 1.

Figure 1

Coding Categories Used in the

Analysis of Conference Data

Statement Number	Number of Lines	Process			Content												
					Teaching										Organization of Teaching		Not Applicable
					Generality		Focus				Domain						
		Who	Type	Direction	Classroom-Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Instructional Interactions	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social-Disciplinary	Other	Student Teaching Protocol	Student Teaching Activities	
5																	

Process data were collapsed across all conferences. Mean frequencies and percentages were used to describe these conferences. Frequencies were derived from the number of typed lines contained within each statement. A statement was defined as one participant's turn in the conversation and may therefore have contained information about more than one topic.

Personality instruments. Many personal qualities have been suggested as being related to teaching and teacher education. Although data were collected from the entire sample on four personality constructs, this paper will focus on two of those; the Rigidity-Flexibility Index and the Self-Perception Inventory. Each construct was self-administered at three different times during the course of the fall semester.

The Flexibility construct measured an individual's capacity to change and to tolerate differences in interpersonal and social settings (Hughes, Griffin, & Defino, Note 3). Rehfish's (1958) Rigidity Scale was modified by the addition of 26 behaviorally-oriented items (for example, "Is uncomfortable in situations in which differences of opinion are aired."). These new items were placed in a Likert-response format. The expanded version, retitled the Different Situations Adaptation Scale (Hughes, et al., Note 3), was pilot-tested with a sample of 63 classroom teachers. Those items with the lowest interitem and item-scale correlations were removed, resulting in a 17-item instrument (alpha = .89). Convergent and discriminant validity was established using the Campbell and Fiske (1959) multitrait-multimethod design.

The Self-Perception Inventory measured the self esteem a teacher formulates as part of an awareness about himself/herself as a teacher (Soares & Soares, 1980). Thirty-six pairs of dichotomous traits (adjectives) were in a Likert-response format. The 72 traits were selected from lists of personality traits related to teaching that were compiled by six groups: (1)

elementary and secondary public school students; (2) student teachers' (3) university supervisors of student teaching; (4) classroom teachers' (5) expert educators; and, (6) personality researchers. The traits were selected on the basis of agreement among the groups, teaching effectiveness research, and subsequent pilot-testing (Soares & Soares, 1980). Test-retest reliability at an interval of four weeks was .89.

Using a bivariate correlational analysis, scores from these measures were examined for strength of association with the content of supervisory conferences.

Teacher instrument. In addition to describing the personal qualities of individuals, a description of teaching related behaviors and attitudes was also sought. In an effort to tap all participants' thoughts, behaviors and attitudes toward teaching they were asked to complete three instruments. This study chose to examine only the cooperating teachers' and student teachers' scores on one of these instruments, the Teacher Concerns Checklist (TCC). The TCC, like the personality constructs, was self-administered at three different times during the course of the semester

This instrument is based on Fuller's (1969) Concerns Theory which states that as teachers move through their careers, their concerns change from "self" to "task" to "impact." The TCC consists of 56 items which are grouped into three factors: (1) Teacher Self-Concerns; (2) Teacher Task Concerns; and (3) Teacher Impact on Student Learning Concerns. The alpha coefficients are, respectively, .86, .79, .91. Test/retest correlations over a 1-week interval are .87, .80, and .77 for three factors.

A bivariate correlational analysis (The Pearson Product Moment) was used to summarize the strength of association between the teaching concerns measure and the content of the supervisory conferences.

Supervisory Conferences

Conferences between 20 student teachers and their cooperating teachers were analyzed in terms of process and content. When examining the process of the communications, who made each comment and the type of comment were noted Content categories included "Teaching," "The Organization of Student Teaching" and "Other." For a detailed description of the analysis and findings of conference data, the reader is referred to O'Neal (Note 5).

Process

As the process data in Table 1 indicate, across all conferences, cooperating teachers tended to dominate the interactions. A mean total of 330.45 lines of type were transcribed for each conference. Of these 330 lines, cooperating teachers spoke approximately 72% of them, while student teachers uttered 28% of the total lines.

Nine categories were used to describe the type of talk that occurred. Data describing the type of talk are displayed in Table 2. When examining the cooperating teachers' talk, the most frequently occurring type was "review." More specifically the cooperating teacher was coded as interacting by reviewing or commenting on classroom events or student teaching activities more often than any other type of interaction. When examining the mean total of typed lines, the cooperating teachers reviewed or commented on classroom events in approximately 37% of these lines. The second most frequently occurring type of teacher interactive behavior was "direction giving." Cooperating teachers gave their student teachers specific directions regarding instruction in approximately 21% of typed lines.

The least frequently occurring type of cooperating teacher statement was "acknowledgement or endorsement." This type of statement contained little information and consisted of the teacher providing his/her partner with a

Table 1

Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher

Conference "Talk"

	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Total
Mean Number of Lines* per Conference	229.86	100.59	330.45
Mean Percentage of Talk by Participant per Conference	71.89	28.11	100.00

* "Lines" refers to the typed lines of a transcribed conference. An average count of 12 words appeared in each typed line of conference data.

Table 2
Process Data From Cooperating Teacher-
Student Teacher Conferences

		Type of Comment**								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Cooperating Teacher	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	46	12.01	15.56	81.91	16.79	23.41	6.03	*	26.86
	Mean Percentage	21.20	7.24	8.29	35.79	5.95	10.17	2.79	*	7.36
Student Teacher	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	*	*	1.88	20.95	*	15.68	19.76	7.70	23.32
	Mean Percentage	*	*	4.35	32.41	*	18.65	23.50	9.12	9.86

* Blank cells indicate that the code was not used for that participant.

** Types of comments:
1. Gives directions
2. Asks about interests
3. Provides evaluative feedback
4. Reviews or comments on classroom events or student teaching events
5. Provides options
6. Describes interests and concerns
7. Acknowledgement
8. Offers suggestions
9. Other

remark such as "yes," "right," "fine," etc. Cooperating teachers' typed lines were classified as acknowledgements in approximately 3% of their statements.

On the other hand, student teachers' statements were classified as acknowledgements in almost 24% of their typed lines. However, student teachers proved to be like their cooperating teachers in that when they participated in an interview, the majority of their talk focused on classroom events. Approximately 32% of the student teachers' statements dealt with the review of classroom events or student teaching activities. The least frequently occurring type of student teacher interactions were those coded as "evaluation."

Content

In addition to classifying conference information as to the process of the interaction, conference statements were also analyzed with regard to what was said. Table 3 summarizes content information across all conferences and all participants. Three categories were included under content: "teaching," "organization of student teaching" and "not applicable." Each conference statement was classified in terms of one or more of these categories. As the data in Table 3 indicate, the majority of all conferences focused on teaching as opposed to the organization of student teaching. The teaching category included all talk dealing with the classroom teaching experience. The organization of student teaching category referred to the training and supervision of the student teachers. On the average, 79.11% of each conference focused on teaching while 18.42% focused on the organization of student teaching.

In addition, content information across all conferences was examined according to the participants' role (i.e., student teacher, cooperating teacher). No substantial differences were noted.

Table 3
Content Data From Cooperating Teacher/
Student Teacher Conferences--All Participants

	Teaching	Organization of Student Teaching	Not Applicable
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers)	*79.11%	18.42%	8.12%

*Percentages equal more than 100% because the "Teaching" category and the "Organization of Student Teaching" category were not mutually exclusive.

The teaching category was then broken down into three subcategories; "generality," "focus," and "domain." Codings under the generality category indicated whether the teaching events discussed were specific to the immediate classroom and student teaching experience or were more general in nature.

The focus category analyzed interactions for information dealing with instructional content and objectives, methods and materials, or the actual execution of the lesson. Statements coded as instructional content and objectives dealt with expected educational outcomes and/or the subject matter related to those outcomes. Statements coded as methods and materials dealt with the materials of instruction and/or those strategic operations designed to achieve objectives. The subcategory, execution of lessons, focused on instructional interactions between the teacher, pupils and content or curriculum.

The third category determined what domain the instructional interaction focused upon (i.e., cognitive, affective, or social/disciplinary). The dimension of instructional domain was adapted from Bloom (Bloom, et al., 1956). Typed lines coded as pertaining to the cognitive domain focused on cognition, knowledge, understanding and learning. The cognitive domain was here restricted to cognitive interactions between pupils and subject matter. Typed lines pertaining to the affective domain focused on pupil interest, involvement and motivation. Typed lines coded as pertaining to the social/disciplinary domain focused on student behavior in terms of control and social interactions.

As the data in Table 4 indicate, all participants tended to be highly specific when discussing teaching events. Typed lines were specific in approximately 91% of all statements dealing with teaching events. In addition, most teaching interactions focused on the methods and materials of

Table 4

Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with Teaching - Mean Number of Typed Lines and Percentages for All Participants*

		Generality		Focus				Domain			
		1*	2	1**	2	3	4	1***	2	3	4
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	211.06	31.83	41.42	126.23	63.36	12.41	155.32	6.86	58.91	22.14
	Mean Percentage	90.71	9.29	18.45	49.20	27.53	5.12	69.14	3.41	21.42	6.12

Note that percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding error.

Categories

* 1. specific statements
2. general statements

** 1. content and objectives
2. materials and methods
3. execution
4. other

*** 1. cognitive
2. affective
3. social/disciplinary
4. other

instruction. Approximately 49% of each conference focused on the methods and materials of the teaching event, approximately 28% of each conference focused on instructional interactions and execution, while 18% of the conference time was devoted to the content and objectives of the teaching events being discussed. Under 6% of the data in this area dealt with a different focus than those stipulated. When the third subcategory, domain, was examined, mean frequencies indicated that cooperating teachers and student teachers tended to be most concerned with the cognitive domain. Concerns with the cognitive domain were addressed more often in instructional conversations dealing with teaching events than the other dimensions of instructional domain (i.e., affective and social/disciplinary). Talk dealing with the cognitive domain dominated 69% of the teaching event statements whereas approximately 21% of all teaching conversations addressed social/disciplinary concerns. The least frequently addressed area within instructional domains was the affective domain. Only 6% of the teaching event statements dealt with concerns in the affective domain.

Again, when data were categorized by participant, student teachers and cooperating teachers were not substantially different from one another.

Supervisory conferences were also examined for talk about the organization of the student teaching experience. All statements that referred to the training and supervision of the student teacher were included in this category and were coded in terms of "protocol" and "activities."

Protocol included all information about the structure, formal procedures, and the administration of student teaching. Activities included all information about events in which the student teacher participated. These events might include observations, preparation of projects for methods

classes, and/or the scheduling of teaching times. Table 5 summarizes the conference data categorized as dealing with the organization of teaching.

As the data in Table 5 indicate, when the organization of student teaching was addressed, participants usually focused on the protocols of student teaching. Approximately 81% of the typed lines dealing with the organization of student teaching were devoted to the protocols of student teaching. The activities of student teaching were discussed in 13% of these typed lines. When the content of the student teachers' and the cooperating teachers' conversations were examined individually a similar pattern emerged.

Summary

An examination of the process of the communications between student teachers and cooperating teachers during supervisory conferences indicated that cooperating teachers heavily dominated the interactions. When the type of talk was examined, participants tended to review or comment on classroom events or student teaching events. In addition a substantial amount of student teachers' conference talk was simply acknowledging what the cooperating teacher had said.

When the content of the conferences was examined, teaching was discussed most often. Both participants tended to make highly specific statements dealing with the methods and materials of teaching. These statements usually focused on the cognitive domain. These few interactions which focused on the organization of student teaching tended to concentrate on the protocols of student teaching rather than a description of the activities themselves.

Participants' Personal Reference Points and Their Relation to Conference Data

In addition to studying the conference data of each dyad (i.e., student teacher/cooperating teacher) scores on two personality measures and one

Table 5
Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with the Organization of Student Teaching - Mean Numbers of Typed Lines and Percentages for All Participants

		Activities	Protocol
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence Per Conference	6.80*	48.24
	Mean Percentages Per Conference	13.29	80.64

*Note that percentages do not add to 100% because they are the averages for all conferences; i.e., each conference contributed equally to the average regardless of each conference's duration.

teaching concern measure were examined. Using a bivariate correlation analysis, scores from each personality measure and each subtest of the teaching concerns measure were compared to selected content categories of the conference data. Specifically, a Pearson product moment correlation was used to summarize the strength of association between personality and teaching concerns measures with selected content of the conference data. The content category "Teaching" was chosen for analysis due to the frequency of occurrence (see Table 3).

Personality Measures

Data from two personality constructs were analyzed by participant's role (i.e., cooperating teacher and student teacher). These scores were then compared to that conference data which had been classified as dealing with teaching. The other two content categories of conference data (i.e., "the organization of student teaching" and "other") were not examined due to their relatively low occurrence (see Table 3).

The flexibility measure was examined first. A high score on the Rigidity-Flexibility Index indicated that this individual was one who had the capacity to change and to tolerate differences in interpersonal and social settings. As the data in Table 6 indicate, cooperating teachers who indicated a high degree of flexibility are unlikely to be different in terms of the specificity or focus of their statements. Highly flexible cooperating teachers did however tend to make statements during supervisory conferences which could be classified as belonging to a particular instructional domain; the cognitive domain. Student teachers who appeared to be highly flexible also seemed to focus on the cognitive domain, but this relationship was not as strong as the negative correlations found in the affective and social/disciplinary domains. Strong relationships were also noted with regard

Table 6

Pearson Produce Moment Correlation Coefficients:
Participant Flexibility as Related to Conference Content

		Specificity		Focus				Domain			
		Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Interaction	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social/ Disciplinary	Other
Flexibility 61	Cooperating Teachers	.07	-.07	.15	.19	-.24	-.16	.32*	-.16	-.27	-.05
	Student Teachers	.15	-.11	.46**	-.43**	-.54**	-.30	.31	-.44**	-.40*	.39*

* $p < .10$

** $p < .05$

to the focus of flexible student teachers' conference talk. The data in Table 6 indicate that highly flexible student teachers are likely to focus on the objectives of teaching events and likely not to focus on the methods and materials needed for instruction or on the execution and/or interaction of that lesson with the pupils.

When the second personality measure was examined, the Self-Perception Inventory, little association was noted between cooperating teachers' high scores on this measure and the specificity of focus of their conference statements. However as the data in Table 7 indicate, strong relationships were noted between cooperating teachers reporting strong self concepts and the domain focused upon in conferences. Those cooperating teachers reporting high self concepts tended to focus on the cognitive domain. These same teachers were also likely not to focus on social/disciplinary concerns or affective concerns.

On the other hand, student teachers reporting high self concepts showed little strength of association with domain. Instead, strong negative correlations were indicated in the focus category. Student teachers who reported high self concepts were likely not to focus on the methods and materials of instruction nor on the execution of and interaction of the lesson with the students. No relationships were noted in the specificity category.

Teaching Measures

In addition to personality measures, participants completed the Teaching Concerns Checklist (Fuller, 1969). This test is subdivided into three subscales to tap teachers' concerns regarding self protection and consolidation (Self), the demands of their jobs (Task) and their effect on students (Impact).

Table 7

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients:
Participants' Self-Perception as Related to Conference Content

		Specificity		Focus				Domain			
		Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Interaction	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social/ Disciplinary	Other
Self Perception 21	Cooperating Teachers	.01	.00	-.02	.15	-.04	-.22	.47**	-.38*	-.42**	.12
	Student Teachers	-.05	.13	.23	-.53**	-.54**	-.27	.31	-.15	-.31	-.05

* $p < .10$

** $p < .05$

Scores on the Self subtest were examined first. As the data in Table 8 indicate cooperating teachers who reported high self concerns showed a strong association with the specificity of their statements during conferences but not with the focus or domain of their statements. Those cooperating teachers with high self concerns were likely to make very specific statements during their conference interactions and were likely not to make general statements. Student teachers with high task concerns showed little relation with the specificity category as well as the focus category. As noted in Table 8 strong relationships can be seen between student teachers with high self concerns and the domain category. Student teachers with self concerns were likely to focus on the social-disciplinary domain and were likely not to focus on the cognitive domain.

Table 9 reports data from the Task subtest of the TCC. Cooperating teachers with high self concerns showed no relation to the specificity of statements made. However, with regard to the focus of their statements, a negative relationship was noted between those cooperating teachers with high task concerns and the execution and interaction of a lesson. With regard to instructional domain these teachers were most likely to focus on the cognitive domain.

Student teachers scoring high on task concerns also showed no association with the specificity category. With regard to focus, student teachers with high task concerns were likely to focus on the execution and interaction of a lesson as well as the methods and materials needed for instruction. When the domain category was examined, two positive correlations and one negative correlation were noted. Student teachers scoring high in task concerns were likely not to focus on the cognitive domain but instead focused on the social/disciplinary domain. In addition, a relationship was noted between

Table 8

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients:
Participants' Self Concerns as Related to Conference Content

		Specificity		Focus				Domain			
		Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Interaction	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social/ Disciplinary	Other
Teaching Concerns: Self £2	Cooperating Teachers	.43**	-.43**	.21	.01	-.15	-.09	.19	-.25	-.08	-.06
	Student Teachers	.31	-.23	-.32	.23	.30	.27	-.50**	.09	.44**	.36**

* $p < .10$

** $p < .05$

Table 9

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients:
Participants' Task Concerns as Related to Conference Content

Teaching Concerns: Task 24	Specificity		Focus				Domain			
	Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Interaction	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social/ Disciplinary	Other
Cooperating Teachers	.17	-.17	.31	.18	-.35*	-.18	.32*	-.7	-.21	-.31
Student Teachers	.28	-.19	-.31	.35*	.41**	.22	-.47**	.37*	.49**	.09

* $p < .10$

** $p < .05$

those student teachers with high task concerns and the affective domain category.

Table 10 displays correlational data regarding scores on the Impact subtest of the TCC and the conference data. Cooperating teachers indicating high concerns with impact showed no association with the specificity or focus categories of the conference data. In the domain category, however, data indicate that cooperating teachers with high task concerns are likely not to focus on the affective domain.

Student teachers scoring high on task concerns, on the other hand, showed no strong associations with the domain or the focus category. They were however likely to make very specific statements and likely not to make general statements during conferences.

Summary

Constructs designed to measure individuals personal reference points regarding themselves and their teaching were analyzed for strengths of association with selected categories of supervisory conference data.

For cooperating teachers, high scores on the personality measures indicated concerns in conferences with the cognitive domain. With regard to the teaching measures, findings varied. Those cooperating teachers with high self concerns tended to make very specific statements during conferences. Those with high task concerns were concerned with the cognitive domain.

More correlations were noted between scores on these measures and student teacher's conference behavior. Those student teachers reporting high flexibility were likely to focus on the objectives of a lesson and not on the methods, materials or execution of a lesson. They also were likely not to mention the affective or social/disciplinary domain. Significant negative correlations were noted between student teachers' reporting strong self

Table 10

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients:
Participants' Concern with Impact as Related to Conference Content

		Specificity		Focus				Domain			
		Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Interaction	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social/ Disciplinary	Other
Teaching Concerns: Impact 92	Cooperating Teachers	.16	-.16	.19	.06	-.11	-.23	.28	-.39*	-.14	-.06
	Student Teachers	.45**	-.42**	-.08	.07	.07	.18	-.26	.01	.17	.31

* $p < .10$

** $p < .05$

concepts and the methods, materials and execution of a lesson. When teaching concerns were examined, those student teachers with high self concerns indicated a strong positive correlation with the social/disciplinary domain and a strong negative correlation with the cognitive domain. Those student teachers reporting high task concerns were correlated with conference talk that focused on the methods, materials and execution of a lesson. They were also strongly correlated with conference talk that focused on the social/disciplinary and affective domain. A strong negative correlation was evident between student teachers with high task concerns and the cognitive domain. When impact was examined, student teachers reporting strong concerns here were highly correlated with specific statements in conferences and negatively correlated with general statements.

Discussion of Findings

To determine how the personal and professional characteristics of cooperating teachers and student teachers relate to the clinical experience, participants' scores on both personality and teaching measures were correlated with observed supervisory behavior.

Flexibility

Previous research has consistently identified flexibility and creativity as important in teacher education (Ekstrom, 1976). Hunt and Joyce (1967) found that student teachers who displayed a wide range of teaching styles were more effective than those who did not. Crocker (1974) found significant relationships between creativity tests scores and student teaching performance. Furthermore, flexibility, as measured by creativity tests was found to be the strongest single predictor of performance. Flexibility may therefore be important to the interactions of those engaged in the student teaching experience.

Results from this study indicate that cooperating teachers and student teachers with high degrees of personal flexibility seem most concerned with the cognitive domain. Possibly these cooperating and student teachers were not concerned with affective or social/disciplinary issues because these areas were not problem areas for them in the classroom. The question then emerges; Are flexible teachers better able to handle students' personal issues (i.e., affective or social/disciplinary problems)?

In addition, highly flexible student teachers tended to focus on instructional objectives ($p < .10$) rather than on methods, materials or execution. These student teachers may feel there are a variety of ways to reach a desired end. As long as lesson objectives are clarified they are satisfied. Therefore, those who supervise student teachers who display a high degree of flexibility should be sensitive to their concerns with lesson objectives. If other issues must be addressed, supervisors might attend to lesson objectives first or phrase their feedback in such a way that it reflects the objective of the lesson.

Self Perception

Positive self perceptions have been related both to teachers' overall mental health (Milgram & Milgram, 1976) and to students' achievement (Rayder, et al., 1978). Others concluded that student teaching success is affected but not necessarily determined by a positive view of oneself (Garvey, 1970; Doherty, 1980). Therefore, research supports the position that higher levels of self perception may be related to many aspects of teaching.

Participants' scores on the Self-Perception Inventory were significantly correlated with areas shown to be of concern during supervisory conferences. As with the flexibility measure, cooperating teachers reporting high degrees of self perception were concerned with the cognitive domain during supervisory

conferences, and chose not to discuss affective or social/disciplinary issues. Although student teachers' self perception scores were not significantly correlated with the domain categories, similar trends were noted (Table 8). Those participants with high degrees of self perception may therefore have been dealing with affective and social/disciplinary issues in their classrooms effectively and therefore able to turn their concerns toward cognitive issues.

As with the flexibility measure, student teachers with high degrees of self perception indicated a concern during conferences with instructional objectives and not with the methods and materials of instruction nor the execution of the lesson. Therefore one may assume that student teachers who perceived highly of themselves felt competent in determining appropriate methods and materials for instruction and therefore focused at a higher level (i.e., instructional objectives). However, whether student teachers who perceive highly of themselves feel competent in the areas of instructional methods and materials and lesson interaction or vice versa, it might behoove the supervisor to focus attention in each of these areas as both efforts could lead to a positive end.

Teaching Concerns

Fuller (1969) investigated the issue of irrelevant teacher education coursework by studying the concerns of preservice and inservice teachers. The Teacher Concerns Checklist (TCC) is composed of three subtests designed to measure teaching concerns in the areas of self, task and impact as they are related to instruction. Identifying concerns as measured by the TCC and comparing them to the instructional concerns noted during supervisory conferences provided a more complete picture of both student teachers and cooperating teachers.

Self-concerns. Cooperating teachers who indicated high self concerns on the TCC made specific statements (rather than general statements) during supervisory conferences. These cooperating teachers, in an effort to protect themselves, may have wanted to be as articulate as possible regarding classroom expectations. Student teachers reporting a high degree of self concern were focusing on social/disciplinary issues in the classroom and issues other than student teaching. They were not concerned with cognitive issues. These student teachers may have been interested in "self preservation" and therefore were concerned with the immediate issues of maintaining appropriate behavior in the classroom.

Therefore, those who supervise student teachers who are concerned with self protection and consolidation should be sensitive to their need to discuss social/disciplinary issues. If other areas are in need of attention, perhaps social/disciplinary issues should be addressed first. In addition, supervisors should be aware that these same student teachers may want to address issues outside the realm of student teaching. Therefore, student teachers who are concerned with self protection and consolidation may require more conference time than their peers.

Task concerns. Cooperating teachers reporting high degrees of task concerns focused on the cognitive domain, yet not on the execution of the lessons. Perhaps, due to their teaching experience, the execution of a lesson was not as crucial to cooperating teachers. Student teachers on the other hand were not in agreement with cooperating teachers with regard to domain. These less experienced individuals who were concerned with tasks showed significant correlations with the social/disciplinary category ($p < .05$) and the affective domain category ($p < .10$). Student teachers with high task concerns were negatively correlated with the cognitive domain

category. In addition they were likely to focus on the methods, materials and execution of a lesson. Therefore, those who supervise student teachers who are concerned about the task demands of their jobs should be sensitive to their need to discuss lesson interactions and social/disciplinary issues. If other areas are in need of attention, perhaps lesson interaction and social/disciplinary issues should be addressed first.

Impact concerns. Cooperating teachers with high impact concerns were not likely to discuss affective domain issues during conferences. In fact, no one content area emerges as a significant focus for "high impact" cooperating teachers. Student teachers, on the other hand, with high impact concerns were likely to make very specific statements, as opposed to general statements during conferences. Perhaps these cooperating teachers were letting their student teachers guide the "flow" of the supervisory conferences allowing no one area to emerge as significant. Student teachers concerned with impact may have wanted their roles and responsibilities specifically articulated and therefore been more categorical during conferences with their cooperating teachers.

Whatever the reason, those who supervise student teachers with high impact concerns may want to articulate their responsibilities as clearly as possible.

Summary and Conclusions

Personal reference points do seem to influence the content of supervisory conferences for both cooperating teachers and student teachers. Although similar scores on both personal and teaching measures seem related to participants with similar concerns during conferences, often concerns differed according to the participant's role (i.e., cooperating or student teacher).

Further study is needed to determine qualitative differences in conferences of those participants matched or mismatched on personal and professional issues.

One major conclusion however emerges from these findings. Those interested in the training of student teachers as well as the training of cooperating teachers must focus efforts in two areas. Both the process of communications between student teachers and their cooperating teachers as well as the content of those interactions are in need of attention.

Reference Notes

1. Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., Hukill, H., & O'Neal, S. Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.
2. Lacefield, W.E., & Cole, H.P. Starting point for curricular change: A predisposition and suitability measure for client groups. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February 1973.
3. Hughes, R., Jr., Griffin, G.A., & Defino, M.E. Personality factors in the student teaching triad. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 1982.
4. MacDonald, A.P., Jr., & Tseng, M.S. Dimensions of internal versus external control revisited: Toward the development of a measure of generalized expectancy. Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, 1972.
5. O'Neal, S. Supervision of student teachers: Feedback and evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.

References

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., Krathwohl, D. R. Taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1956.

Campbell, D., & Fiske, D. Convergent and discriminent validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 81-105.

Copeland, W. Affective dispositions of teachers in training toward examples of supervisory behavior. Journal of Educational Research, 1980 74, 37-42.

Crocker, A.C. Predicting teaching success. London: NFER Publishing, 1974.

Doherty, J. An exploratory investigation into the relationship between self-esteem and teaching performance in a group of student teachers. Educational Review, 1980, 32, 21-35.

Ekstrom, R. Teacher aptitude, knowledge, attitudes, and cognitive style as predictors of teaching behavior. Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 27, 329-331.

Fuller, F.F. Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Garvey, R. Self-concept and success in student teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 1970, 21, 357-361.

Hunt, E.D., & Joyce, D.B. Teacher trainee personality and initial teaching study. American Educational Research Journal, 1967, 4, 253-259.

Milgram, R.M., & Milgram, N. Self-concept differences in student teachers in primary, secondary, and special education. Psychology in the Schools, 1976, 13, 439-441.

Rayder, N. F., Abrams, A. L., & Larson, J. C. Effect of socio-contextual variables on child achievement. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 58-63.

Rehfish, J. Some scale and test correlates of a personality rigidity scale. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 372-374.

Soares, A., & Soares, L. The self-perception inventory: Composite test manual. Bridgeport, CT: Also Corporation, 1980.

Southall, C., & King, D. Critical incidents in student teaching. Teacher Educator, 1979, 15, 34-36.

Weller, R. Verbal communication in instructional supervision. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Zeichner, K. Key processes in the socialization of student teachers: Limitations and consequences of oversocialized conceptions of teacher socialization. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Figure 1

Coding Categories Used in the

Analysis of Conference Data

Statement Number	Number of Lines	Process			Content													
					Teaching										Organization of Teaching		Not Applicable
					Generality		Focus				Domain						
		Who	Type	Direction	Classroom-Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Instructional Interactions	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social-Disciplinary	Other	Student Teaching Protocol	Student Teaching Activities	